

March 12, 2002

Mr. U. H. Specht Legal Advisor City of Carrollton 2025 Jackson Road Carrollton, Texas 75006-1739

OR2002-1187

Dear Mr. Specht:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 159694.

The Carrollton Police Department (the "department") received a request for all records wherein two named individuals were either a complainant or a suspect as well as for all calls for service at a particular address. You have released some documents to the requestor but claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685.

Where an individual's criminal history information has been compiled by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right to privacy.

See United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989). In this instance, the requestor asks for all records wherein two named individuals are suspects. In this case, we believe that these individuals' right to privacy has been implicated. Thus, to the extent that the submitted information includes documents wherein either named individual is a possible suspect, we conclude that you must withhold this information under common law privacy as encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. See id.

You also make a common law privacy claim with respect to item #3. We note that the information in item #3 relates to a sexual assault. With respect to information pertaining to sexual assault or other sex-related offenses, this office has previously concluded that, generally, the only information that may be withheld under common law privacy is information that identifies or tends to identify the victim. See Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982); see also Morales v. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment is highly intimate or embarrassing information and public does not have legitimate public interest in such information). However, in instances where the requestor knows the identity of the victim, the governmental body is required to withhold the entire report. Based on the wording of the request, the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. Thus, the department must withhold item #3 in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101.

Finally, we address your argument under section 552.108. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(a); see also Ex parte Pruitt, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We have marked those documents that you may withhold under section 552.108(a)(1).

In summary, you must withhold item #3 in its entirety under principles of common law privacy incorporated by section 552.101. To the extent that the submitted information includes documents wherein either named individual is a possible suspect, you must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with principles of common law privacy. Finally, under section 552.108, you may withhold the information we have marked.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. Id. § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. Id. § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Denis C. McElroy Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

DCM/seg

Ref: ID# 159694

Enc. Marked documents

c: Mr. Clark E. Birdsall Attorney at Law P.O. Box 820578 Dallas, Texas 75382 (w/o enclosures)